

## Response to Comments Table Visual Resources (October 5, 2009)

Page #, Ref.	Commenter	Comment	Response
<b>General</b>	Lisen Bonnier	Reinstate Los Osos Valley Road and Avila Beach Drive as candidate scenic corridors.	Avila Beach Drive is listed on Table VR-2 (page 9-12) as a candidate corridor. Los Osos Valley Road from the San Luis Obispo city limits to approximately Clark Valley Road has already been afforded visual protections through standards for the San Luis Obispo Area Plan and the Estero Area Plan (found in the Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance).
<b>Pg. 9.1 Title</b>	Staff	Title: Visual Resources	<b>Revise:</b> add <u>s</u>
<b>Pg. 9.2 Major Issues</b>	Giacoletti	Suggest changing wording: "Development will inevitably occur within some of the county's scenic areas."	The existing wording is accurate, as this is reasonably certain to occur.
<b>Pg. 9.8 Policy VR 2.1</b>	Agriculture Department	Policy VR 2.1 indicates AGP30b4 has been revised. AGP's were not supposed to be revised. Is this reference incorrect or has the policy been revised?	The notation means that the wording of Policy VR 2.1 was modified somewhat from AGP30b4 in the Agriculture Element, while retaining its intent. However, Policy AGP30b4 has not been revised. In this case, Policy VR 2.1 is to "...encourage designs that are compatible with the natural landscape and with recognized historical character, and discourage designs that are clearly out of place within rural areas." AGP30b4 reads: "In prominent locations, encourage structures that blend with the natural landscape or are traditional for agriculture."
<b>Pg. 9.9 Policy 2.2</b>	Farm Bureau	Revise Policy: "...Encourage abundant native and/or drought-tolerant landscaping that screens buildings and parking lots and blends development with the natural landscape while taking into consideration fire safety in the selection and placement of the plant materials."	Agree with the idea. <b>Revise by adding a new last sentence:</b> " <u>Consider fire safety in the selection and placement of plant material, consistent with Biological Resources Policy BR 2.7 regarding fire suppression and sensitive plants and habitats.</u> "
<b>Pg. 9.9 IS 2.3.1</b>	Farm Bureau	Remove "standards" and retain "guidelines."	Maintain the option of including standards in the existing or revised <i>Countywide Design Guidelines</i> .
<b>Pg. 9.9 IS VR 2.3.1</b>	LOCAC	Protecting rural vistas, such as along Los Osos Valley Road, should have the highest priority. Protection does provide a rural separation from developed area.	The IS is to revise the <i>Countywide Design Guidelines</i> to protect rural visual character. This IS has a high priority (see Table VR-3 on page 9.18).
<b>Pg. 9.9 Goal 3</b>	Sierra Club	Revise: "The visual identities of communities will be preserved by maintaining rural separation between them. <u>A formally approved separators overlay will be approved by 2010.</u> "	Time frames to carry out goals and policies are typically provided in implementation strategies, not goal statements. In this case, see IS 3.1.1 on page 9.10. Table VR-3 on page 9.18 shows this IS beginning in 2010.

<b>Pg. 9.10 IS 3.1.1</b>	Farm Bureau	We are concerned with the density of one unit per 20 acres for farm worker housing.	This IS has flexibility to consider higher density farm worker housing, as it uses the phrase "apparent density."
<b>Pg 9.11 Policy 3.3</b>	Farm Bureau	Add implementation that would direct support for non-profits.	Agree. <b>Revise:</b> "Collaborate with community advisory councils, cities, <del>and</del> landowners, <del>and</del> <u>non-profit conservation organizations to propose voluntary, scenic, agricultural or conservation easements...</u> "
<b>Pg. 9.11 Goal 4</b>	Sierra Club	Revise: Visual resources will be protected within <u>SRA's</u> and scenic corridors along well-traveled highways and roads.	SRA's are addressed in Policy VR1.1 and its implementation strategies.
<b>Pg. 9.11 Policy VR 4.1</b>	LOCAC	All hilltops should be protected, with no building silhouetting allowed. Many jurisdictions do this and the preserved views are most welcomed. Corridor design standards should be applied uniformly along viewsheds.	The corridor studies for each viewshed that are proposed in VR 4.1.1 should determine which features are to be protected and the types of development to be regulated.
<b>Pg. 9.11 IS 4.1.1</b>	Farm Bureau	Include area property owners in the work plan to study and designate scenic roads and highways.	Agree. <b>Revise:</b> add item e) at the end: " <u>e): Involve area property owners.</u> "
<b>Pg. 9.12 Table VR-2</b>	Sierra Club	Candidate Scenic Corridors should include: Los Osos Valley Road between Foothill Road and Clark Valley Road. Also include Avila Beach Road.	See the response to the first comment on the first page of this table.
<b>Pg. 9.12 Table VR-2</b>	Staff		<b>Revise Table VR-2:</b> Include Lopez Drive from Huasna Road to Lopez Lake Recreation Area as a candidate scenic corridor per Policy OSP 24 in the Agriculture and Open Space Element.
<b>Pg. 9.13 IS VR 4.1.3</b>	LOCAC	Consider installing road signs that have the silhouette of a major feature such as a castle or mountain top on the sign with the name below. Thus, your drive is informative and answers the question "what is this that we see coming up." This could work well with all the Morros or other features.	These signs could be considered as part of the scenic treatments and signs identified in IS 4.1.3.
<b>Pg. 9.15 Goal 7</b>	Sierra Club	Revise: "Views of the night sky and its constellations of stars will be maintained. <u>No public night lighting shall illuminate (be visible) above the horizontal plane from the light source by 2020.</u> "	The goal to maintain the night sky view is adequate as written. IS 7.1.1 is to amend the Land Use Ordinance to minimize impacts to the night sky from glare and the amount of light. The proposed standard appears difficult to measure and regulate. Also, it is unclear whether it applies only to <i>public</i> facilities. It also seems to imply that some sort of retrofitting of existing lighting will be required if it violates the proposed standard.
<b>Pg. 9.15 Policy VR 8.1</b>	Sierra Club	Add IS VR 8.1.1: " <u>The ordinance shall be amended to stipulate that billboards shall not be rebuilt if more than 75% of their physical structure has been lost.</u> "	This proposal is challenging from a legal standpoint. <b>Revise numbering of IS VR 8.1 and 8.2 to 8.1.1 and 8.2.2</b>
<b>Pg. 9.16 Policy VR 9.1</b>	Sierra Club	Revise: " <del>Encourage</del> <u>Require where feasible</u> all existing areas with overhead lines, particularly the candidate Scenic Corridors listed in VR-2, to be placed underground..."	This policy applies to overhead lines that are generally located within road and highway rights-of-way or utility easements. Such lines would generally not be placed in agricultural fields, either before or after undergrounding.

		<u>Areas of active agriculture that would require overhead lines be placed in active fields shall be exempt from this requirement.</u>	The best way to achieve undergrounding is through an existing program set up for this purpose and overseen by the County Undergrounding Coordinating Committee. Requiring individual developers to do such undergrounding in connection with proposed development projects would not be appropriate, except perhaps in the case of large projects. In those cases, requirements (other than those in the existing ordinance for on-site undergrounding) should only be imposed after site-specific review and on a case-by-case basis.
<b>Pg. 9.17 Policy VR 9.4</b>	LOCAC	Revise: <del>“Encourage</del> <u>Require</u> co-location of communications facilities (one or more companies sharing a site, tower or equipment) when feasible and where it would avoid or minimize adverse visual effects.”  Also, consider prohibiting “fake trees” or restricting the location where they could be used.	The existing ordinance standards for wireless communication facilities seek to co-locate such facilities, but this is not always feasible. Proposed revisions to the ordinance (see VR 9.1.1) will consider standards for screening.
<b>Pg. 9.17 Policy VR 9.4</b>	Sierra Club	Revise: <del>Encourage</del> <u>Require</u> co-location of communications facilities where it would avoid or minimize adverse visual effects.	See the response to the previous comment.